

Serial No.: 09/899,410

REMARKS

The Applicants note that a first response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 was filed via facsimile on June 12, 2003. However, this June 12th response was transmitted to an incorrect fax number.

This Supplemental Response of June 13, 2003 is identical to the response of June 12, 2003. The Applicants are submitting this response because it is believed that the first response of June 12, 2003 will not be properly matched with the application filed. Any confusion that this Supplemental Response may generate is regretted.

The Applicants thank Examiner Bello for his careful review of this application. Consideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments to the application and in view of the following remarks. The Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in dependent Claim 4. The Applicants have taken this allowable subject matter and have incorporated it into each of the independent claims as will be discussed below.

Claims 1-52 have been rejected. Upon entry of this amendment, Claims 3, 4, and 26 are canceled while Claims 1, 2, 5-25, and 27-52 remain pending in this application. The independent claims for this application are Claims 1, 21, 24, and 41.

A marked-up version of the changes made to the claims is not being submitted since the claims listed above have been submitted according to the new procedures entitled, "USPTO ANNOUNCES PROTOTYPE OF IMAGE PROCESSING," and cited in 1265 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 87 (Dec. 17, 2002) ("Prototype Announcement"). If the Examiner believes the present amendment to be non-responsive because a marked-up version of the claims is not present, Examiner Bello is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss the matter prior to the Examiner issuing such a non-responsive notice.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) in connection with this response. To facilitate efficient and rapid processing of this response, the Applicants

Serial No.: 09/899,410

are sending copies of the non-U.S. Patent references via facsimile. Meanwhile, the U.S. Patent references cited in this IDS were sent via Express Mail (under Express Mail No. EV 331953067 US) on June 12, 2003 since the number of pages for transmitting the U.S. Patent references via facsimile would be too voluminous for this type of transmission.

If the Examiner needs a copy of a U.S. Patent reference from the Applicants immediately prior to receiving the mailed copy of the U.S. patent references for proper consideration, he is requested to contact the undersigned. The Applicants are requesting the Office to charge the undersigned's deposit account for the requisite fee to have these references considered by the Examiner. Consideration and an Examiner initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form listing these references are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19-24, 31-35, 37, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,385,366 issued in the name of Lin (hereinafter, the "Lin reference"). The Examiner has also rejected Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 18, 25-27, 29-30, 36, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin.

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 3, 41, and 43-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,325,223 to Bears (hereinafter, the "Bears reference"). In addition, the Examiner has rejected Claims 6, 28, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bears reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,975,899 to Faulkner (hereinafter, the "Faulkner reference"). The Examiner has also rejected Claims 13 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lin reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,864 to Williams et al. (hereinafter, the "Williams reference").

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 21, 24, and 41

The rejections of Claims 1, 21, 24, and 41 are respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that the Lin, Bears, Faulkner, and Williams references considered alone or in combination fail to describe, teach, or suggest the recitations enumerated in amended independent Claims 1, 21, 24, and 41. Because the subject matter of allowable dependent Claim

Serial No.: 09/899,410

4 and its corresponding dependent claims have been incorporated into each of the respective independent claims, the Examiner's rejections based on the prior art of record have been rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 1, 21, 24, and 41 are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2, 5-20, 22-23, 25, 27-40, and 42-52

The Applicants respectfully submit that the above identified dependent claims are allowable because each of their respective independent claims are patentable over the cited references. The Applicants also respectfully submit that the recitations of these dependent claims are of patentable significance.


In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the pending rejections of Claims 2, 5-20, 22-23, 25, 27-40, and 42-52.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed on March 26, 2003. The Applicants and the undersigned thank Examiner Bello for his consideration of these remarks. The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is hereby courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, or that there are any formalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned in the Atlanta Metropolitan area at (404) 572-2884.

Respectfully submitted,


Steven P. Wigmore
Registration No. 40,447

King & Spalding
45th Floor, 191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30303
404.572.4600
K&S Docket: 08286.105003